

CITY OF BOULDER, COLORADO

BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS MEETING MINUTES

Name of Board / Commission: Water Resources Advisory Board	
Date of Meeting: 27 April 2015	
Contact Information of Person Preparing Minutes: Andrea Flanagan 303.413.7372	
Board Members Present: Vicki Scharnhorst, Dan Johnson, Ed Clancy, Mark Squillace Board Members Absent: Lesley Smith	
Staff Present: Jeff Arthur, Director of Public Works for Utilities Annie Noble, Flood and Greenways Engineering Program Coordinator Katie Knapp, Engineering Project Manager Kristin Dean, Utilities Planner Ken Baird, Utilities Financial Manager Douglas Sullivan, Acting Principal Engineer for Water, Wastewater and Stormwater Tom Settle, Water Treatment Manager Ward Bauscher, Engineering Project Manager Kevin Clark, Utilities Project Manager, Sourcewater Infrastructure Steve Buckbee, Engineering Project Manager Christin Shepherd, Civil Engineer Milford John-Williams, Budget Analyst Andrea Flanagan, Board Secretary Cooperating Agencies Present: Alan Turner, Senior Project Manager, CH2M HILL Shea Thomas, Urban Drainage and Flood Control District	
Meeting Type: Regular	
Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order	[7:00 p.m.]
Agenda Item 2 – Approval of the 16 March 2015 Meeting Minutes Motion to approve minutes from March 16 as presented. Moved by: Squillace; Seconded by: Johnson Vote: 4:0 (Lesley Smith absent)	[7:00 p.m.]
Agenda Item 3 – Swearing In/ Election of Officers Ed Clancy was sworn in for his term on the WRAB. Motion by: Johnson; Seconded by: Squillace Move to postpone election of officers until such a time as all five board members are present to vote. Current arrangement of officers would continue until that time. Vote: 4:0 (Lesley Smith absent)	[7:03 p.m.]
Agenda Item 4 – Public Participation and Comment Public Comment: Karl Anuta, Crif Crawford, Bruce Thompson (each speaker took a portion of the pooled time) Karl Anuta spoke on behalf of residents of Frasier Meadows Retirement Community and presented a petition with signatures to the Board to ask for their support in the construction of a flood control facility, south of highway US 36. Citizens are concerned about the South Boulder Creek area, which the city has studied for many years. Over 300 homes of the total homes damaged by the flood event were on the west side of Foothills. This is not a flood that came up through basements, or caused by an over-taxed sewer system. This flood damage was caused strictly by surface water flowing over the turnpike and into homes, as well as the retirement community. Much of the Frasier Meadow's infrastructure was severely damaged, including several major buildings. Asking for Board support for construction of this area. Crif Crawford: Showed videos of flooding at: Table Mesa and US 36, Frasier Meadows (from Thunderbird), Underground Garage to illustrate the flows and seriousness of the flood waters in their community.	[7:04 p.m.]

Bruce Thompson

Asking for Board support to further prevent water from South Boulder Creek Basin from topping over US 36 and overflowing into residential areas, west of Foothills Parkway. Highest priority is saving lives. If anyone had been in the Frasier Meadows parking garage, they might not have survived. It took less than 15 minutes to take 88 cars. Residents had to be carried across 3 feet of water to safety, which is a miracle that no one was lost. 43 residents of Frasier Meadows are present today and instead of speaking individually, they signed a sheet agreeing to these comments.

Al LeBlang

Concurs with the aforementioned statements.

Clinton Heiple

This was not a gently rising flood; this was water that came on very quickly and if anyone had been sleeping in their basement they could have died. Primary responsibility of government is to protect the lives and safety of its citizens. Hopes for Board to move forward.

Laura Tyler

Member of the South Boulder Creek Steering Committee, shared update about what the group is doing. Concerned that safety piece was not addressed at earlier study session. Group has reached out to City Council members, as well as University of Colorado (CU) staff. Reactions have been overwhelmingly positive. Council sees this as an opportunity to cooperate with CU. CU representatives are very positive and both groups clearly see the seriousness of this situation. There is a feeling of momentum. Shared a clip from Daily Camera about annexation and shared quote about the city's plans for South Boulder Creek Mitigation Project and Southeast Boulder section and wanted to include this as part of the conversation. This conversation is happening and it is very positive.

Payson Sheets

Spoke about a possible future hazard that he would like to have avoided, with regard to expansion of Eldora ski area. Family moved to Boulder in 1920's and remembers ski area working cooperatively with residents, but they are now unwilling to listen to residents. Sediment load is going into Peterson Lake and they would like to build additional trails, which would cause greater sediment issues. The ski area has been granted an expansion in both directions. EPA in Denver looked at their plans and found that the environmental impact statement was incomplete, and they were unable to assess the environmental impacts. Feels that this needs to be reassessed by the City. Nederland Advisory Board is preparing objections and he urges Board to file a firm objection to the expansion. Read from a key statement by Bret Linenfelser from April, 2014. Appreciates anything the Board can do to protect Boulder Creek.

Jim Johnson

Represents Southeast Boulder Neighborhood Association, which includes surrounding neighborhoods. Appreciates Board hearing the group's message, which is that they want to work together with the City, County and FEMA to prevent water from further flooding these neighborhoods. Held up a map to show the Board. Hopes group can plan ahead with University of Colorado and would appreciate anything the Board can do to work with these entities to help protect residents. Mitigation is needed badly.

Agenda Item 5 –**[7:28 p.m.]****Public Hearing and Consideration of a Recommendation to City Council Regarding the Gregory Creek Mitigation Study**

Katie Knapp and Utilities staff presented the item to the board.

Executive Summary from the Packet Materials:

The purpose of this memorandum is to present the Gregory Canyon Creek Draft Flood Mitigation Plan (**Attachment A**) for the WRAB's consideration, input and recommendation to Council.

The city has retained CH2MHill to evaluate potential alternatives to help alleviate future flooding along Gregory Canyon Creek. CH2MHill's Alternative Analysis Memorandum ("Analysis") is included as

Appendix A of the Draft Flood Mitigation Plan (**Attachment A**). This Analysis contains a detailed description of the data and models used to determine the improvements which would help flood conveyance along Gregory Canyon Creek. The intent of the Analysis was to identify various types of improvements which could be constructed along the creek corridor, assess the costs and benefits associated with each improvement, and include an engineer's recommendation.

Staff reviewed the Analysis and developed a staff recommended plan based on the engineering recommendation, input from the public and observations from the 2013 flood event. The staff recommended plan is illustrated graphically in Section 6 of the Draft Flood Mitigation Plan (**Attachment A**) which also includes additional information about the Gregory Canyon Creek watershed, the planning process and the alternatives considered. Please note that not all sections of the document have been completed. Pending consideration and input from WRAB, conceptual drawings will be developed and the mitigation plan will be finalized and presented to City Council for acceptance.

WRAB Discussion Included:

- Question about four private culverts and asked if property owners agree to dedicate easements in order for city to install
- Question if residents support installing a pedestrian bridge.
- Stated that it is likely that we will exceed a ten-year flood and questioned if infrastructure will support anything greater than a 10-year flood.
- Asked about the cost-to-benefit analysis and questioned the numbers presented because they did not match what is in the report.
- Commented that a 7% discount rate is not realistic. Concerned that if the discount rate is changed, the numbers will be skewed.
- Suggests the calculations be made under different discount rates. Numbers seem speculative.
- Stated that the culvert replacement over the ten-year event does make sense.
- Asked for further clarification on method used for property acquisition.
- Stated that it is odd that city would agree to pay for the easements and suggested further discussion of this topic.
- Asked if there is a consideration at this time for what would come first as a priority, so that larger problems are not created and requested further clarification of the overall timeline approach.
- Questioned how the benefits get assessed in this situation.
- Requested further clarification on road improvements and property acquisition and whether these aspects could not be made part of the recommendation and instead, be a part of another program?
- Stated that this project affects neighborhoods directly and recommends a more adaptive approach that allows adjustments as more information is found out and suggests adding this to recommendation.
- Requested clarification on whether there is a reason that street improvements need to be included in the recommendation.
- Stated that Board has been discussing Gregory Creek since 2008 and something needs to happen.
- Requested whether it is normal practice for landscaping to be replaced, if damaged.
- Recommended that residents be asked to grant easements without compensation, as to allow funding to be stretched.
- Stated that if property value increases, it seems odd that the city would pay for easements.

Public Comment:

Holly Pearen

Stated that staff and Board have been very open and solicitous to the neighborhood concerns. As the plan has developed, the landowners have some concerns, both on macro and micro scales. Inconsistencies lead to deep concern. Glad that benefit-cost analysis has been addressed. The value of the damages presented in the documents are inconsistent. Has to be some sort of calibration to what actually happened. Understands that the damages are estimated, but this cannot be accurate. No realistic assumptions about the value can be made based on these numbers. Open to hearing explanation as to

how these numbers were arrived at from CH2M Hill. Landowners would appreciate if city and CH2M Hill could be more transparent about the cost to landowners. If in fact properties gain or lose value, tell them how much and reflect this in the budget. If easements will be given to the city for free, this may not be realistic, especially based on her experience throughout this process.

Stewart Machle

Would like to thank city for all the help given to him since the flood. Rock walls have been rebuilt. Question about intersection of Anderson Ditch and Gregory Creek. Heard comment about an overhead culvert or culvert separate from Gregory Creek and agrees they should be separated. Asks if a decision has been made about what is going to be done with this location, as this is a critical area.

Laz Nemeth

Asked why everyone is in favor with box culverts. They are ugly. Preference is for keeping Anderson Ditch open so children can play there. Running water is aesthetically pleasing. Based on personal experience, Anderson Ditch was actually shut off during the flood. There was no more flow in Gregory Creek afterwards. Something needs to be done. Asks if there is a reason for always having two box culverts and if it is more cost-effective.

Rebecca Roser

Part of her property is Anderson Ditch, which goes to the edge of her property. Flows stopped in Anderson Ditch, because it was filled to the top with silt during the flood. Agrees that the area where Gregory Creek and Anderson Ditch come together is an issue because it's at the edge of her property. Appreciates that neighbors have been solicited and looking forward to working with city with regard to easements.

Motion by: Squillace; **Seconded:** Johnson

Vote: 4:0 (Lesley Smith absent)

Motion Passes

Staff requests Water Resources Advisory Board consideration of this matter and action in the form of the following motion:

Motion to recommend the Gregory Canyon Creek Flood Mitigation Plan be finalized based on the Staff Recommended Plan and presented to City Council for acceptance.

Agenda Item 6 –

[8:40 p.m.]

Information Item – Preliminary Draft 2016 Utilities Budget (Water, Wastewater and Stormwater/ Flood Management) including the 6-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

Douglas Sullivan, Ken Baird, Annie Noble, Kevin Clark, Steve Buckbee, and other Utilities staff presented the information item to the board.

As part of the city's annual budget process, Utilities develops a six-year planning budget, this year for the time period of 2016 through 2021. The Water Resources Advisory Board (WRAB) role in this process is defined in the Boulder Revised Code: "... to review all environmental assessments and capital improvements conducted or proposed by the utilities division." Utilities staff has formulated initial revenue and expenditure projections for each of the three utility funds through the year 2021. Within the budget process, City Council approves and appropriates funds only for the first year, 2016. In addition to the six year CIP described above, Utilities staff develops a 20-yr CIP. The purpose of the 20-yr CIP is to look at long range needs for all three utilities. The 20-yr CIP is a valuable mechanism to look at upcoming regulatory requirements, asset management needs for aging facilities, and the associated debt service for existing bonds.

This agenda item provides an opportunity for the WRAB to discuss a "preliminary draft" of the CIP. Input from WRAB will guide staff in preparation of a draft CIP for discussion by WRAB at the May meeting. WRAB will be asked to make a recommendation to City Council regarding the 2016-2021 CIP at its June meeting. The Planning Board will review the complete city CIP, including utilities, in July. City Council generally plans for two study sessions in September, prior to adopting the 2016 budget.

WRAB Discussion Included:

- Stated that there is some concern that the rate increases may be a bit heavy, considering they have been flat for so long. Concerned that rate increases won't stop. This could largely impact commercial users.
- Stated that perhaps we should exercise more thoughtfulness on how we conserve water and consider the possibility of selling our product (water) while we have it. If we continue to conserve, what are we losing in revenue?
- Stated that the issue is complicated, because if we don't conserve, then we need to acquire new water supplies.
- Stated that these changes could be more significant than the public may even understand.
- Expressed concern that we may be on a track that is not aligned with inflation.
- Stated that what some local communities want that is in the best interest of protecting their properties, may not actually be what's best for the community at large.
- Commented that we do need to play catch-up on sewage updates, as we saw what happened during the flood event in 2013.
- Stated that CII was never completed and suggest revisiting.
- Asked whether there is any potential to sell any of our resources to generate additional revenue.
- Questioned whether our plant investment fee is high enough and whether or not it is fair for people who buy in later.
- Questioned if there was any conclusion that came from the inspection of sewer lines that were inspected by a pipeline 'submarine.'

Agenda Item 7 – Matters from the Board:**[10:12 p.m.]****Board Member Clancy brought up the below matter(s):**

- Requested clarification on dates for future open houses.
- Requested to find out if PowerPoint presentations will be posted following meetings.

Board Member Johnson brought up the below matter(s):

- Requested more information on Eldora expansion, with regard to public comment.

Agenda Item 8 – Matters from Staff:**[10:15p.m.]**

- Kim Hutton provided an update on water supply for 2015. There is no need to implement water restrictions at this time, based on current snow pack conditions.
- Department of Health and Human Services has recently released a fluoride recommendation. City is determining next steps and will follow up at future meeting.

Agenda Item 9 – Future Schedule**[10:24p.m.]****May:**

- South Boulder Creek Mitigation
- Skunk Creek Mapping Update
- Update on Wastewater and Stormwater Collection System Master Plans
- Preliminary Capital Improvements Program update
- Boulder Civic Area Update
- Boulder Creek Mitigation Plan Update

Adjournment**[10:31 p.m.]**

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, by motion regularly adopted, the meeting was adjourned at **10:31p.m.**

Motion to adjourn by: Johnson; **Seconded by:** Squillace

Motion Passes 4:0 (Lesley Smith absent)

Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting:

The next WRAB meeting will be **Monday, 18 May 2015 at 7:00 p.m.**, at the **City's Municipal Services Center, 5050 Pearl St., Boulder, CO 80301**

APPROVED BY:

ATTESTED BY:

Board Chair

Board Secretary

Date

Date

An audio recording of the full meeting for which these minutes are a summary, is available on the Water Resources Advisory Board web page.

<https://bouldercolorado.gov/boards-commissions/water-resources-advisory-board-next-meeting-agenda-and-packet>

DRAFT